

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

MR. ELVIS WAYNE JONES,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	2:12-cv-00019-JAW
)	
TEXAS TDCJ ID)	
ADMINISTRATION, et als.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER ON OBJECTION TO RECOMMENDED DECISION

On January 18, 2012, Elvis Wayne Jones filed a complaint against a number of defendants, asserting violations of his civil rights. *Compl.* (Docket # 1). On January 20, 2012, the Magistrate Judge screened the allegations in the Complaint and recommended that it be dismissed as frivolous. *Recommended Decision to Dismiss Compl. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)* (Docket # 2). Mr. Jones had until February 6, 2012 to object. Aware of the mailbox rule, the Court tugged on the time limit in this case and waited until February 28, 2012 to affirm the Recommended Decision without objection. *Order Affirming the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge* (Docket # 3); see *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266 (1988); *Casanova v. Dubois*, 304 F.3d 75, 78-79 (1st Cir. 2002). The Clerk entered Judgment against Mr. Jones on February 29, 2012. *J.* (Docket # 4). As these things tend to go, Mr. Jones' objection, which is dated February 3, 2012, was filed the very next day, March 1, 2012. *Objection to Report and Recommended Decision* (Docket # 5).

In view of Mr. Jones' status as a *pro se* prisoner, the Court VACATES its Order dated February 28, 2012 (Docket # 3) and the Judgment dated February 29, 2012 (Docket # 4). The Court turns to Mr. Jones' objection. Mr. Jones' seven-page objection and his two exhibits do not address the Magistrate Judge's articulated concerns about the nature of his claim and the basis of this Court's jurisdiction. His papers are simply incoherent and it is hard to know what to make of his multiple grievances. However, whatever is going on here has nothing to do with the District of Maine.

Following the filing of the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision and Mr. Jones' objections, the Court reviewed and considered the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision together with the entire record and has made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision. The Court concurs with the recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in her Recommended Decision, and determines that no further proceeding is necessary.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that the Complaint (Docket # 1) be and hereby is DISMISSED pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and § 1915A(b)(1) as the Complaint is frivolous and fails to state a claim.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ John A. Woodcock, Jr.
JOHN A. WOODCOCK, JR.
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 5th day of March, 2012